

### R. L. Stevenson in California.

In the same month and town to W. E. Henley writes from the same town to W. E. Henley: "This is a lovely place which I am growing to love. The sea is so close that you can hear the roar of the surf from the beach; there is no place but the Pacific coast to hear eternal roaring surf. When I get to the top of the woods behind Monterey, I can hear the seas breaking all round over twelve miles of coast from near Carmel on the left out to Point Pinos in front and away to the right along the mouth of the Monterey to Castroville. The mouth of the Salinas is so swarming yesterday that the world could get lost in it, what I mean was that you should be kept in suspense like Mohammed's coffin until the world had made half a revolution. Then dropped here at the station as though you had stepped from the cars. You would then comfortably walk to the station and I shall deposit you at Sanchez's saloon where you will be met. If you are introduced to Bronson, the local editor, 'I have no brain,' he says, 'I am a mechanic, you see,' but he's a nice fellow; to Adolpho Sanchez, who is delightful. Meanwhile I go to the P. O. for my mail; then we walk up Alvarado street together; you now see the old mission and the old mission building on the wooden sidewalk, I call at Hader's for my paper; at length behold us installed in Simoneau's little whitewashed back room around a dirty table cloth, with Francois, the waiter, perhaps an Italian fisherman and Simoneau himself, Simoneau, Francois and I. There were waiters in the room, but I am sure mere waiters. Then home to my great airy room with the windows opening on a balcony, I sleep on the floor in my camp blanket; you install yourself in bed; in the morning, coffee with the doctor and his little wife, we hire a wagon and make

[illegible]

AN American Animal and a Member of Society.

We are indebted to Dr. PAUL TOPINARD for valuable discussion of the main problems the philosophy of science in a book entitled *Science and Faith* (Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Company). The title is, to some extent misleading for the author has much to say about the history of science, but it holds, indeed, that the two words mutually exclude each other. Science is knowledge, faith belief. Science considers things objectively, and accepts only what is demonstrated by observations, generalizations and inductions arriving at agnosticism. That is, stopping at the point where we use the word "therefore," we decline to have recourse to a dubious hypothesis. Faith, on the contrary, subjective, individual and dependent on cerebral sensibilities, as the latter has been instituted by heredity, education, habits and a temperament of the subject. In Dr. Topinard's opinion these are the two ways to demonstrate the compatibility of the truths established by science with the beliefs dictated by faith. I shatter the latter. A faith which is examined and shown to be in accord with facts ceases to be faith. It is, at the same time, admitted that, in the epoch of mankind's history, the latter has been the only way to attain to the extolling certain articles of faith, as Kant has done. It is even conceded that certain philosophical doctrines ought to be advocated. Dr. Topinard would not deny that the four or five principles, especially the principle of justice, which society makes for its base, are ideas which should be attached to the articles of faith, but he would have it perfectly understood that the two domains of science and faith are totally different, are, in other words, two contrary poles.

It is science, therefore, and not faith, which is invited to consider in the volume before us. The book is written by a contributor to sociology, but it possesses the merit of being addressed by an original inquirer of high rank in a partment of science which constitutes the groundwork of sociology; consequently, its conclusions have sprung from a direct and unmediated contact with the facts, and not from a derivative and second-hand knowledge of them. Whatever objections, therefore, some of its special tenets may evoke, its importance

the reason is that the former take it for granted that the individual arraigned against him has no rights at all. In fact, however, the rights of each co-laborer are so evident that they will be treated as footing of equality before the tribunal. The state of nature, man is restricted in his only by his individual will, with or without thought as to their consequences. If he thinks another can kill an animal without being killed or maiming himself, he does so. If he wishes to deprive another too great a right, he abstains from doing so. Toward his fellow being he is not less free to act as he pleases, but more motives go to influence his conduct. One person is concerned to him; another is useful to him, renders services, amuses him, loves him, another is dangerous to him, he does so. If he wishes to know what their roles will not then be of use whether that other will then not be of use himself? Will the other not then behave as he has behaved to-day? There again, it will his family, what will tribal opinion. People will censure him, will avoid him, will hate him, will fight him, will punish him, and so, and what restrictions he should impose on his first impulses. The word *rights*, even if he assumes that he has any vague notion of meaning of the kind, he would be incapable understanding. He acts according to the circumstances; his conduct is restricted as much as he is in contact with one of his fellows; it is still more so when he is in contact several, and more so again when there are many, as in societies. It is the same with obligations. By the very fact that the obligations knows how to modify his conduct according to the circumstances, he knows that such and such acts must not be done, that he must respect the personality of others which, in turn, will respect his. It is evident that the obligations which he assumes made by way of exchange. The whole relation is one of reciprocity. There is no under-lying force, no law, no principle, which simply wrongly to the savage and the barbarian the former comprehends it no more than shorter.

Among men more or less near the state of nature, acts are produced spontaneously, as they are among animals; they are produced in the conditions given, they are not subject to reflection. But in the social condition, the whole thing, the idea of reciprocity, is the whole thing, the idea of

[illegible][illegible][illegible]